



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,852	06/01/2001	Paul B. McCray JR.	IOWA:031US	1110
7590	11/04/2003		EXAMINER	
Steven L. Highlander Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. Suite 2400 600 Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1653	
DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/872,852	MCCRAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Hope A. Robinson	Art Unit 1653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-27, 37-55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8, 28-32 and 34-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5 and 33 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group IV (claims 29, 32-36, SEQ ID NO: 4) on September 22, 2003 is acknowledged. Upon examination of the instant application it was noted that SEQ ID NOS:2, 3 and 4 are closely related as SEQ ID NO: 2 encompasses the other two sequences. As applicant elected the product, the other product claims will be rejoined. For clarification the previous restriction requirement has been vacated in favor of the following:

- I. Claims 1-8 and 28-36 are drawn to an isolated antimicrobial peptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- II. Claims 9-10 and 37-38 are drawn to a nucleic acid molecule, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- III. Claims 11-27 and 39-55 are drawn to a method of inhibiting growth of a microbe, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:  
Inventions I, II, IV and V are patentably distinct because the products have different structures, functions and modes of operation.

The nucleic acid of Invention II are related to the protein of Invention I by virtue of encoding same. The DNA molecule has utility for the recombinant production of the protein in a host cell. Although the DNA molecule and protein are related since the DNA encodes the specifically claimed protein, they are distinct inventions because the

protein product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification from the natural source. Further, the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the protein, such as nucleic acid hybridization assay.

Invention I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). For example, the product of Invention I can be used to make antibodies.

Invention II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). For example, the product of Invention II can be used in a hybridization assay.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Furthermore, the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as a separate subject for inventive effect and require independent searches. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature

search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious the other group. Moreover, as to the question of burden of search, classification of subject matter is merely one indication of the burdensome nature of the search involved. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, election of a single group for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise

proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86(March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

### ***Claim Disposition***

4. Claims 1-55 are pending. Claims 1-8 and 28-36 are under examination.

### ***Claim Objection***

5. Claims 5 and 33 are objected to as the claims depend from a rejected based claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 28-32 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Adler et al. (WO 99/13080, March 18, 1999).

Adler et al. disclose the claimed peptide (claims 1, 28 and 29). The sequence reported by the reference is 100% identical to the sequence set forth in SEQ ID NOs:2, 3 and 4 and as claims 1, 28 and 29 recite the open language "comprising" (see SEQ ID NO: 1 of the reference) the reference sequence anticipates the claims. Adler et al. also teach a pharmaceutical composition and acceptable carrier (claims 2-3) and that the composition can be administered topically (claims 4 and 32), as an inhalant (claims 8 and 36), parenterally (claims 6 and 34) and intravenously (claims 7 and 35), see page 56 of the reference. Thus, the claimed invention is anticipated by this reference.

***Conclusion***

7. No claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is

(703)308-6231. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 6:30 P.M. (EST).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor Christopher S.F. Low, can be reached at (703) 308-2932.

Any inquiries of a general nature relating to this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. The official fax phone number for Technology Center 1600 is (703) 308-2742. Please affix the Examiner's name on a cover sheet attached to your communication should you choose to fax your response. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG (November 15, 1989).

Hope A. Robinson, MS *HR*  
Patent Examiner

*Christopher S. F. Low*  
CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600